

1 *Rusen*, 709 F.2d 1340, 1341 (9th Cir. 1983). If a single one of the claims in the petition is unexhausted,
2 therefore, the Court is obliged to dismiss the petition for lack of exhaustion. After reviewing the petition
3 in this case, it appears to the Court that all of petitioner's claims may be unexhausted.

4 According to the petition, petitioner did not present his claims to the Nevada Supreme
5 Court. *See* pages 4 and 6 of the petition (admitting failure to exhaust grounds for relief). From the face
6 of the petition, therefore, petitioner has admitted that his claims for relief have not yet been exhausted
7 in state court. Additionally, it appears that the petition is untimely under the one-year statute of
8 limitations provided by the AEDPA at 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d). He admits that his post-conviction appeal
9 was decided on October 4, 2007, but that he did not present the instant federal petition for mailing until
10 September 30, 2010. Thus more than one year has past while not appeal or petition was pending before
11 the state courts which might toll the limitations period.

12 Pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the court must dismiss
13 such a petition where it is clear on its face that no relief is available. The petition shall be dismissed
14 without prejudice. Petitioner may, if he can, prepare and file new petition in a new action, if he can
15 demonstrate that he has actually exhausted his claims and that he has not allowed the statute of
16 limitations to expire without having a properly filed petition pending in this court or in a state court.

17 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Petition is **DISMISSED WITHOUT**
18 **PREJUDICE**. The Clerk shall enter judgement accordingly.

19 Dated this 26th day of October, 2010.

20
21 
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26